

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **January 8, 2004**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-7, 9-17, 19-27, and 29. Claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-24, and 26-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaizuka et al (USPN 6,396,507, hereinafter “Kaizuka”). Claims 5, 15, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaizuka in view of Hanson et al (USPub 2003/0098845, hereinafter “Hanson”).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 11, and 21 were rejected as being unpatentable over Kaizuka. Applicant respectfully points out that Kaizuka teaches that enlargement simply occurs when the **magnifier moves on top** of the text on which it moves as described by the Examiner in the extant office action. However, according to the teaching of Kaizuka, there is no change in magnification level within the magnified area during a move of the magnifier, only a change in the position of the magnifier.

In contrast, the present invention is directed to changing the **magnification level** within the magnified area in proportion to the speed in which the magnifier is being moved (see page 7, lines 20-24 of the instant application). By changing the magnification level within the magnified area in proportion to the speed in which the magnifier is being moved, the present invention allows a gradual onset of magnification. This is advantageous because it presents a smooth transition to the user when the magnifier is being dragged. There is nothing within Kaizuka that suggests changing the magnification level within the magnified area in proportion to the speed in which the magnifier is being moved so that the onset of magnification is gradual.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 11, and 21 to clarify that the present invention is directed to changing the magnification level

within the magnified area in proportion to the speed in which the magnifier is being moved so that the onset of magnification is gradual. These amendments find support on page 7, lines 20-24 of the instant application.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 10, and 20 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-7 and 9-10, which depend upon claim 1, claims 12-17 and 19-20, which depend upon claim 11, and claims 22-27 and 29, which depend upon claim 21 are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By


Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47, 615

Date: January 20, 2004

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
508 Second Street, Suite 201
Davis, CA 95616-4692
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665